

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION**

TYLER RAY SCHRIBER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 2:25-cv-532-PPS-AZ
	)	
ALEX SLIGER, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Pro Se Plaintiff Tyler Ray Schriber's Motion to Lift Stay or in the Alternative Clarify Discovery Stay [DE 25], filed on April 6, 2026, and Amended Motion to Lift Stay or in the Alternative to Clarify the Docket [DE 26], filed on April 8, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Court held an initial hearing with the parties during which Plaintiff requested leave of Court to file an amended complaint in response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. DE 17. The Court granted Plaintiff leave and Defendants indicate they would review the amended complaint and then determine how they would respond. *Id.* Defendants were given until April 13, 2026 (later extended to April 23, 2026, *see* DE 23) to answer or otherwise respond to the amended complaint. But in light of the uncertainty as to how the case would proceed, the parties agreed to forego entry of a scheduling order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 at that time, and the Court stayed discovery until the pleadings were settled either with an answer or ruling on a forthcoming motion to dismiss. DE 17.

After that initial hearing but before Defendants' deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint, Plaintiff filed his motions to lift the discovery

stay. In his motion, Plaintiff says that the need for a stay has been obviated because he filed an amended complaint which resulted in the original motion to dismiss being denied as moot. *See* DE 21. But now Defendants have once again sought dismissal of Plaintiff's amended complaint through the filing of a new motion to dismiss. DE 28, 29. Thus, the underlying premise for the stay of discovery in this case remains in effect. And while the "[f]iling a motion to dismiss does not automatically stay discovery," courts recognize that a stay of discovery is warranted "when a party raises a potentially dispositive threshold issue" like qualified immunity. *Applegate v. St. Vincent Health, Inc.*, 2023 WL 2612408, at *1 (S.D. Ind. Mar. 23, 2023). Here, Defendants have raised numerous arguments as to why Plaintiff's amended complaint should be dismissed, including on qualified immunity and state law immunity grounds. *See generally* DE 29 at 19-26. And because the court did not enter a scheduling order or set deadlines yet regarding discovery, there is no case management plan in place that would be upset.

Accordingly, a continue of the stay of discovery in this case is warranted so Plaintiff's Motion to Lift Stay or in the Alternative Clarify Discovery Stay [DE 25], and Amended Motion to Lift Stay or in the Alternative to Clarify the Docket [DE 26] are **DENIED**. The Court **REMINDS** Plaintiff that his response to Defendants' motion to dismiss is due by **May 4, 2026**. *See* N.D. Ind. L-R 7-1(d)(2).

So ORDERED on this 14th day of April 2026.

/s/ Abizer Zanzi

MAGISTRATE JUDGE ABIZER ZANZI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

cc: Plaintiff Tyler Ray Schriber (U.S. Mail)